

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed March 8, 2005 has been carefully reviewed along with the references cited therein. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings asserting that the feature of claim 4 was not depicted in the drawings. The Examiner also objected to claims 9 and 16 due to minor informalities. The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-14, 16, 20-22, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Goetz (U.S. Patent No. 2,013,145). Claims 5, 11, 15 and 17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter.

In this response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 9, 13, 16 and 18-22. Applicant has cancelled claims 2, 5, 6, 14, 15, 17, 24 and 25. These claims have been cancelled without prejudice and may be prosecuted in a continuing application.

Claim 4 has been amended to overcome the § 112 rejection and the objection to the drawings. Support for this amendment can be found in FIGURE 1 and at paragraph [0021]. Claim 9 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection. Also, the objectionable language has been removed from claim 16.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the first wall includes a first plurality of grooves and the second wall includes a second plurality of grooves. Claim 1 is similar to original claim 5; however, claim 1 does not recite that the second plurality of grooves align with the first plurality of grooves. Nevertheless, Goetz fails to disclose a first wall including a first plurality of grooves and a second wall including a second plurality of grooves in combination with the remainder of the limitations recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 and those depending from it patentably define over the cited reference.

Claim 26 has been added to the application and it depends from claim 1. Claim 26 recites "wherein the second plurality of grooves align with the first plurality of grooves." This limitation, in combination with the remainder of the limitations recited in claim 1, further patentably defines over the reference.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite “a first insert plate received in the housing cavity and selectively mounted to one of said walls” and “a second insert plate received in the housing cavity and adapted to selectively mount to at least one of the walls and be selectively received by the first insert plate.” In the Examiner’s Reasons For Allowable Subject Matter, he indicated that “Goetz fails to disclose that a second insert plate is received in the housing cavity and is selectively mounted to at least one of the walls and selectively received by a first insert plate.” Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 13 as amended patentably defines over Goetz.

Claim 16 has been amended to recite “said insert plate including a first surface and a plurality of tabs extending from and substantially normal to the first surface.” In the Examiner’s Reasons For Allowable Subject Matter, he indicated that “Goetz fails to disclose that the insert plate has a plurality of tabs extending from and normal to a surface of the plate.” Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 16 as amended patentably defines over Goetz.

Claim 29 has been added to the application. It recites, among other things, “a strike plate housing comprising a strike plate, a first wall extending from the strike plate, and a second wall extending from the strike plate and the first wall, the first wall including a first plurality of grooves and the second wall including a second plurality of grooves.” Goetz fails to disclose a second wall that extends from the strike plate and the first wall that includes a plurality of grooves, in combination with the other limitations of claim 29.

Claim 31 has been added to the application. In allowing claim 5, the Examiner indicated that “Goetz shows that the opposite side does not have a plurality of grooves that are align with the first plurality of grooves at the opposite side so that the inserting plate could be placed and secured between the two opposite sides of the strike plate housing.” Even though claim 31 is not limited to having grooves, Goetz fails to disclose the limitations recited, and therefore Applicant believes that claim 31 is patentable over Goetz.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted that all claims remaining in the application are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early indication of the same is earnestly solicited. In any event, should the Examiner consider personal contact

advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

June 7, 2005  
Date


  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Cornely, Reg. No. 41,687  
Jonathan A. Withrow, Reg. No. 54,548  
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor  
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579  
216-861-5582

---

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Express Mail Label No.:	
Date	Printed Name
June 7, 2005	Audrey M. Dragony

FILENAME \p N:\TKMZ200007\USVAMD0004411V001.doc